



1 12 U.S.C. §1819(b)(2)(B). The Ninth Circuit has acknowledged that when Congress amended  
2 the FDIC's enabling statute by enacting the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery and  
3 Enforcement Act (FIRREA), "it greatly expanded the FDIC's ability to remove cases to federal  
4 court." *Bullion Services, Inc. v. Valley State Bank*, 50 F.3d 705, 707 (9th Cir. 1995). In 12  
5 U.S.C. § 1819(b)(2)(B), Congress "confer[red] several procedural advantages on the FDIC that  
6 go beyond the general removal authorization found in 28 U.S.C. §§ 1441-1452." *Id.* There is  
7 no doubt that enacting FDIC's removal statute evidences Congress's desire that cases involving  
8 the FDIC should generally be heard and decided by the federal courts. *Id.*

9 In this case, FDIC was substituted as a party twice, once on August 11, 2010 and once  
10 on October 20, 2010. FDIC argues that being substituted twice gives it two opportunities to  
11 remove the action to federal court. Defendants argue that there is only one chance for FDIC to  
12 remove the case, based on the first instance it is substituted as a party. It is unclear based on  
13 the statutory language if the right to remove is renewable and the Ninth Circuit has not  
14 addressed this issue specifically.


15 A district court in Wisconsin held that the right to remove was renewable under the  
16 statute. In *FDIC v. First Mortgage Investors*, 459 F.Supp. 880 (E.D. Wisconsin 1978), the  
17 FDIC participated as the plaintiff (after being appointed as receiver) in the underlying state  
18 court action without removing to federal court. After the FDIC lost a motion for summary  
19 judgment in state court and the defendant filed a counterclaim. After the filing of the  
20 counterclaim, the FDIC moved for removal. The court held that even if the FDIC waived its  
21 rights to remove, "its right was renewed when the defendant filed its counterclaim." *Id.* at 882.  
22 Other courts have appeared to follow suit. *See e.g., F.D.I.C. v. S&I 85-1, Ltd.*, 22 F.3d 1070,  
23 1072 (11th Cir. 1994)(FDIC, as original plaintiff in state court proceeding, had additional  
24 removal rights accrue upon the filing of the counterclaims against it); *Yankee Bank for Finance*  
25 *& Sav., FSB v. Hanover Square Associates-One Ltd. Partnership*, 693 F.Supp.1400, 1411

1 (N.D.N.Y. 1988) (FDIC's removal rights were renewed when party served amended answers  
2 and counterclaims upon the FDIC).

3 These cases are distinguishable from the present suit, because in the present suit, FDIC  
4 was first substituted as a party to the counterclaims and subsequently substituted as a party to  
5 the remaining claims. Regardless, it does not change the reasoning why other courts have held  
6 that the right to remove is renewable. The FDIC's decision to remove or not remove a case will  
7 depend on what claims it is substituted as a party for. Given that the FDIC cannot predict what  
8 kinds of claims it will face it should be allowed to remove within 90 days after it is substituted  
9 as a party for any claim. Accordingly the Court finds that FDIC is allowed to remove the  
10 action within ninety days after it was substituted as a party on all the remaining claims on  
11 October 20, 2010. FDIC removed this action on December 3, 2010 and it is therefore timely  
12 under 12 U.S.C. § 1819(b)(2)(A).

13 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Defendants KC2-2, LLC, et al.'s Motion to Remand  
14 (ECF No. 8) is **DENIED**.

15 DATED this 23rd day of September, 2011.

16  
17   
18 \_\_\_\_\_  
19 Gloria M. Navarro  
20 United States District Judge  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25